

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Inventors: Robert E. Haines et al. |) | |
| |) | Attorney |
| Serial No: 09/874,104 |) | Docket Number: 10003219-1 |
| |) | |
| Filed: June 4, 2001 |) | Confirmation No.: 6048 |
| |) | |
| Title: System And Method For |) | Group Art Unit: 2141 |
| Requesting Computer Resources |) | |
| |) | Examiner: Kristie D. Shingles |

APPEAL BRIEF

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP, a limited partnership established under the laws of the State of Texas and having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware Corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holding, LLC.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative or the Assignee which will affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-11, 15 and 17-23 are pending. Claims 2, 4, 7, 12-14 and 16 have been canceled. The rejections of all pending claims (Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-11, 15 and 17-23) are appealed.

Serial No. 09/874,104
Attorney Docket No. 10003219-1
Appeal Brief

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.

No amendments were filed after the final action.

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.

The following is provided pursuant to Rule 41.37(c)(1)(v) which requires "a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings if any, by reference characters." Nothing in this Section 5 should be construed to limit the scope of any of the claims involved in the appeal, which are enumerated in full in Appendix I to this Appeal Brief.

Independent Claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method for requesting a resource from a web server in which a web client, in response to receiving user input defining a URL, automatically transmits a request to a remote cookie store for a cookie that is valid for the URL; then later, the web client receives a second cookie from the web server; and, in response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmits the second cookie to the cookie store for storage. The method of Claim 1 includes:

a web client receiving input from a user defining the URL (e.g.: transaction 302 in Fig. 3 and step 610 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, lines 18-19 and page 9, lines 19-21);

in response to receiving the user input, the web client automatically transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (e.g.: transaction 304 in Fig. 3 and step 612 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, lines 19-23 and page 9, lines 22-24);

then the web client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer (e.g.: transaction 306 in Fig. 3 and step 614 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, lines 24-30 and page 9, line 26);

the web client transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the web server (e.g.: transaction 308 in Fig. 3 and step 618 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, line 32 through page 6, line 2 and page 9, lines 28-30);

the web client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the web server (e.g. step 604 in Fig. 6A and Specification page 9, lines 12-14); and

in response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage (e.g. step 608 in Fig. 6A and Specification page 9, lines 15-16).

Independent Claim 6. Claim 6 is directed to a computing device (e.g., cookie store 24 in Fig. 1 and cookie store 416 in Fig. 4) that includes: means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first web client; means for receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second web client different from the first web client; and means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie to the second web client if the first URL is within the first range of URL's. E.g., cookie server 25 in Fig. 1 and processing unit 450 with memory 452 and cookie server program 454 in Fig. 4. The functional aspects of the recited means is described in the Specification, for example, at page 6, lines 20-31¹ for cookie server 25 in Fig. 1 and at page 11, lines 13-23 with regard to transactions 814, 818, 819, and 820 in Fig. 8 for processing unit 450 in Fig. 4.

Independent Claim 15. Claim 15 is directed to a system in which a remote cookie store receives and stores cookies from plural web clients. The system of Claim 15 includes:

first and second web clients (e.g., web clients 412 and 414 in Fig. 4); and

a computer remote from the web clients (e.g., cookie store 416 in Fig. 4);

the first and second web clients are each operable to receive a resource and a cookie from a web server and configured to automatically respond thereto by processing the resource and transmitting the cookie to the remote computer, and the first web client is operable to receive a URL from a user and is responsive thereto by transmitting a request to the remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (e.g., Figs. 6A and 6B and "Operation of each web client" in the Specification at page 9, lines 9-30);

the remote computer is operable to receive a first cookie from the first web client and to then store the first cookie, receive a second cookie from the second web client and to then store the second cookie, and to receive the request from the first web client

¹ There is typographical error at page 6, line 31 in the Specification (undiscovered until now) -- URL #1 should be URL #2, as is apparent from the immediately preceding discussion at lines 20-29.

and is responsive thereto by (a) transmitting the stored first cookie to the first web client if the stored first cookie is valid for the URL and (b) transmitting the stored second cookie to the first web client if the stored second cookie is valid for the URL (e.g., Figs. 7A and 7B and "Operation of the Cookie store" in the Specification at page 10, lines 4-19).

Independent Claim 21. Claim 21 is a computer readable medium counterpart to method Claim 1 and recites similar limitations. Computer readable medium embodiments are provided for in the Specification at page 16, lines 7-9. Claim 21 includes programming for a web client, in response to receiving user input defining a URL, automatically transmitting a request to a remote cookie store for a cookie that is valid for the URL; then later, the web client receiving a second cookie from the web server; and, in response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmitting the second cookie to the cookie store for storage. The computer readable medium of Claim 21 includes programming for:

a web client receiving input from a user defining the URL (e.g.: transaction 302 in Fig. 3 and step 610 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, lines 18-19 and page 9, lines 19-21);

in response to receiving the user input, the web client automatically transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (e.g.: transaction 304 in Fig. 3 and step 612 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, lines 19-23 and page 9, lines 22-24);

then the web client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer (e.g.: transaction 306 in Fig. 3 and step 614 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, lines 24-30 and page 9, line 26);

the web client transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the web server (e.g.: transaction 308 in Fig. 3 and step 618 in Fig. 6B; Specification page 5, line 32 through page 6, line 2 and page 9, lines 28-30);

the web client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the web server (e.g. step 604 in Fig. 6A and Specification page 9, lines 12-14); and

in response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage (e.g. step 608 in Fig. 6A and Specification page 9, lines 15-16).

Independent Claim 22. Claim 22 is a computer readable medium counterpart to device Claim 6 and recites similar limitations. Computer readable medium embodiments are provided for in the Specification at page 16, lines 7-9. Claim 22 includes programming for: receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first web client; receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second web client different from the first web client; and responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie to the second web client if the first URL is within the first range of URL's. E.g., Specification page 6, lines 20-31 for cookie server 25 in Fig. 1 and page 11, lines 13-23 with regard to transactions 814, 818, 819, and 820 in Fig. 8 for processing unit 450 in Fig. 4.

Independent Claim 23. Claim 23 is a computer readable medium counterpart to system Claim 15 and recites similar limitations. Computer readable medium embodiments are provided for in the Specification at page 16, lines 7-9. Claim 23 includes programming for making:

first and second web clients operable to receive a resource and a cookie from a web server and configured to automatically respond thereto by processing the resource and transmitting the cookie to the remote computer, and the first web client operable to receive a URL from a user and is responsive thereto by first transmitting a request to the remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (e.g., Figs. 6A and 6B and "Operation of each web client" in the Specification at page 9, lines 9-30); and

a remote computer operable to receive a first cookie from the first web client and to then store the first cookie, receive a second cookie from the second web client and to then store the second cookie, and to receive the request from the first web client and is responsive thereto by (a) transmitting the stored first cookie to the first web client if the stored first cookie is valid for the URL and (b) transmitting the stored second cookie to the first web client if the stored second cookie is valid for the URL (e.g., Figs. 7A and 7B and "Operation of the Cookie store" in the Specification at page 10, lines 4-19).

6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED.

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 21 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears 6934736 in view of Narin 7039699.

2. Claims 6, 8-11, 15, 17, 22, and 23 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears and Narin in view of Quatrano 6748420.

3. Claims 18-20 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears, Narin and Quatrano in view of Silverbrook 6813039.

7. ARGUMENT.

GROUND NO. 1

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 21 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears 6934736 in view of Narin 7039699.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 21 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears 6934736 in view of Narin 7039699.

As detailed below, the subject matter of Claims 1 and 21 is fundamentally different from Sears and Narin -- the remote cookie store receives cookies for storage from web clients, not from web servers.² (This distinction applies to the other claims also, as detailed below in Ground Nos. 2 and 3.)

In the method of Claim 1, a web client receives input from a user defining the URL. In response to receiving the user input, the web client automatically transmits a request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL. Then, the web client receives a first cookie from the remote computer. The web client transmits both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the web server and receives the resource and a second cookie back from the web server. In response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmits the second cookie to the remote computer for storage.

Claim 21 is a computer readable medium counterpart to method Claim 1 and recites similar limitations.

² The claims, however, do not exclude the cookie store from also receiving cookies for storage from a web server.

Web Client Transmitting Cookies To Remote Cookie Store. As noted above, in the method of Claim 1, the web client transmits the cookie to the remote computer for storage. Sears teaches a remote cookie server. The remote cookie server in Sears, however, receives the cookies from the web servers (or builds the cookies based on information from the web servers), not from the web clients. E.g., Sears column 2, lines 35-38. The Examiner acknowledges this deficiency in Sears, but asserts that Narin supplies the missing element:

Nonetheless, *Narin et al*, explicitly teach that the client ... transmitting the new, updated cookie to a server for storage (*col.4 lines 14-17, col.9 lines 62-67, col.9 lines 51- 57, col. 11 line 66-col.12 line 10, col. 10 lines 23-31, col. 13 lines 38-43*).

Final Office Action, page 4. This assertion is not correct.

Each of the passages in Narin cited by the Examiner is reproduced below.

Narin column 4:

15 transferred back to the client computer for future use. When additional content is requested by client computer from the server computers, the cookie is included in the subsequent request for content. Accordingly, the cookie is processed for

Narin column 9:

updated domain cookie (not shown). For example, when a user requests content from a given content provider (e.g. a request for a Web page from a Web site), for the first time, a cookie associated with that content, consisting of electronic data in the form of a file header is transmitted to the client computer 20a from the content provider's server computer 10a. In the alternative, when a user requests content from a previously visited content provider (e.g. a request for a content from a previously visited Web site), content provider's server computer 10a transmits electronic data to update the domain cookie previously created and stored on client computer 20a. In either scenario, the computing application facilitating the communication between the user and the content provider, that is, browser 180 of the client computer 20a, maintains the newly created or updated domain cookie and will transmit it on every HTTP request to servers that are inside the cookie's domain.

Narin column 10:

As mentioned briefly, a cookie may be included (i.e. in the situation where a client computer visited a given content provider's server previously) in a request for content from a particular content provider's server, such as server 10a. In the event that client computer 20a revisits content provider's server 10a, content provider server 10a is now able to determine if client computer 20a has visited content provider's server 10a from the information, or lack of information, that may be present in the transferred cookie.

Narin columns 10 and 11:

COM content and transmit the desired content back to client
computer 20a. If client computer 20a has not been to content
provider's server 10a or 10a' before, content provider's

server 10a and 10a' create cookies 110'(b)(1) and 110'(b)(2),
respectively, and populates cookies 110'(b)(1) and 110'(b)(2)
to store general information about client computer's
requests. Created cookies 110'(b)(1) and 110'(b)(2) are trans-
mitted with the desired content to client computer 20a.
Client computer 20a, in turn, passes cookies 110'(b)(1) and
110'(b)(2) to the browser processing and storage space 180a of
computing application browser 180. The created cookie is
now ready for use with future requests for content by client
computer 20a.

Narin column 13:

Generally, as part of computing application browser 180
functionality, cookies associated with desired content are
included with a request for such content. That is, if a client
computer navigates to content A and a cookie is associated
with content A, the cookie is included in any subsequent
request for content A. In the context of the present invention,

These passages in Narin stand for the unremarkable proposition that if a web
client requests content from a web site/server, the web site/server returns a cookie (or a
cookie update) to the web client along with the requested content -- the web client
stores the cookie in its browser. In the method of Claim 1, by contrast, when the web
client receives a cookie from the web server, the web client transmits the cookie to a
remote computer for storage. Narin does not teach the web client transmitting a cookie
or cookie update to a cookie store remote from the web client -- the "computing
application browser 180" in Narin resides on the web client, not on a remote cookie
store.

Web Client Automatically Transmitting Cookie Request To Cookie Store. In the
method of Claim 1, the web client receives input from a user defining the URL and then,
in response to receiving the user input, automatically transmits a request to the remote
computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL. The Examiner asserts that Narin
teaches this automatic transmission, as follows:

Final Office Action page 2:

- A. Applicant argues that the cited prior art of record, *Narin et al*, fails to teach that the Web client automatically transmits a cookie request to the remote computer.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. *Narin et al* specifically teach transmitting a cookie request when a request is made for web content (*Figures 7, 8a and 9, col.4 lines 4-10, col.10 lines 23-31*). *Narin et al*'s ability to transmit the cookie request along with the content request is an automatic function that achieves the functionality of the claim language. The rejection is therefore maintained.

Final Office Action page 4:

second cookie to the remote computer for storage. Nonetheless, *Narin et al*, explicitly teach that the client includes the cookie in the request for content to the web server and transmitting the new, updated cookie to a server for storage (*col.4 lines 14-17, col.9 lines 62-67, col.9 lines 51-57, col.11 line 66-col.12 line 10, col.10 lines 23-31, col.13 lines 38-43*).

The Examiner has misinterpreted the elements of Claim 1, confusing the request for content from the web server with the request for a cookie from the remote cookie store. In Claim 1, the web client automatically transmits a request *to the remote computer* for a cookie valid for the URL. Thereafter, the web client transmits the cookie and a request for the resource to the web server. The passages in *Narin* cited by the Examiner describe a web client requesting content from the web site/server, not a web client requesting a cookie from a remote cookie store in general, and specifically not automatically transmitting a cookie request to a remote cookie store in response to receiving the user input.

Narin teaches a conventional procedure in which a user requests a web page from a web site and, in response, the web server automatically transmits a cookie to the web client along with the web page. A subsequent request for content to the web server may also include the cookie. E.g., *Narin* column 10, lines 23-27. Even assuming the user request for a web page in *Narin* includes the web client receiving user input defining a URL, as claimed, *Narin*'s web client does not thereafter automatically request a cookie and it does not request anything from a remote computer different from the web server. Rather, *Narin*'s web client requests the web page from the web site/server in response to receiving user input. *Narin*'s web client requesting *something else* from *somewhere else* is wholly irrelevant to the "automatic transmission" element of Claim 1.

In summary, the combination of Sears and Narin does not disclose the following elements from Claims 1 and 21:

in response to receiving the user input, the web client automatically transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL; and

in response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage.

In evaluating the question of obviousness, the Examiner must determine the scope and content of the prior art and then ascertain the differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). The Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness based upon the prior art. MPEP § 2142. "[T]he focus when making a determination of obviousness should be on what a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have known at the time of the invention, and on what such a person would have reasonably expected to have been able to do in view of that knowledge." MPEP 2141(II) Office Personnel As Fact Finders. The Examiner has misinterpreted the scope and content of the prior art (Narin) and, accordingly, she has failed to properly ascertain the differences between the prior art and the subject matter of Claims 1 and 21. As a result, the legal conclusion of obviousness is not supported in the record. The Examiner has, therefore, failed to carry her burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness as to Claims 1 and 21 and Claims 3 and 5 depending from Claim 1.

GROUND NO. 2

Claims 6, 8-11, 15, 17, 22, and 23 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears and Narin in view of Quatrano 6748420.

Claims 6, 8-11, 15, 17, 22, and 23 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears and Narin in view of Quatrano 6748420.

The computing device of Claim 6 includes: means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first web client; means for receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second web client different from the first web client; and means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie to the second web client if the first URL is within the first range of URL's. Claim

22 is a computer readable medium counterpart to computing device Claim 6 and recites similar limitations.

In the system of Claim 15, a remote cookie store is operable to receive cookies from first and second web clients. Claim 23 is a computer readable medium counterpart to system Claim 15 and recites similar limitations.

The rejection of Claims 6, 15, 22 and 23 is based on the assertion that Sears and Narin teach a remote cookie store receiving cookies from web clients. Final Office Action page 5. As detailed above under Ground No. 1, this assertion is not correct. In Narin, the web client receives cookies from the web server. E.g., Narin column 9, lines 51-57. There is no remote cookie server in Narin. In Sears, the cookie server receives cookies from the web servers (or builds the cookies based on information from the web servers), not from the web clients. Sears column 2, lines 35-38.

The Examiner has misinterpreted the scope and content of the prior art (Sears and Narin) and, accordingly, she has failed to properly ascertain the differences between the prior art and the subject matter of Claims 6, 15, 22 and 23. As a result, the legal conclusion of obviousness is not supported in the record. The Examiner has, therefore, failed to carry her burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness as to Claims 6, 15, 22 and 23 and Claims 8-11 and Claim 17 depending from Claims 6 and 15, respectively.

GROUND NO. 3

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears, Narin and Quatrano in view of Silverbrook 6813039.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sears, Narin and Quatrano in view of Silverbrook 6813039.

Claims 18-20 depend from Claim 15 (through Claim 17). The rejection of Claims 18-20 is based on the assertion that Claim 15 is obvious over the combination of Sears, Narin and Quatrano. For the reasons noted above under Ground No. 2, Claim 15 distinguishes patentably over Sears, Narin and Quatrano. For these same reasons, therefore, Claims 18-20 distinguish patentably over Sears, Narin and Quatrano in view of Silverbrook.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Appellants
Reg. No. 35,974

APPENDIX I -- CLAIMS INVOLVED IN THE APPEAL

1. A method of requesting a resource having a URL from a web server, comprising:
a web client receiving input from a user defining the URL;
in response to receiving the user input, the web client automatically transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL; then
the web client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer;
the web client transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the web server;
the web client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the web server;
and
in response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage.

2. (canceled)

3. (original) The method of claim 2, wherein the first request transmitting step is performed by transmitting the first request over a network to the remote computer.

4. (canceled)

5. The method of claim 3, wherein the network comprises the INTERNET.

6. A computing device, comprising:
means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first web client;
means for receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second web client different from the first web client; and
means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie to the second web client if the first URL is within the first range of URL's.

7. (canceled)

8. The computing device of claim 6, wherein the first cookie receiving means is configured to receive the first cookie from the first web client over a network; and wherein the first request responding means is configured to transmit the first cookie to the second web client over the network.

9. The computing device of claim 8, further comprising:
means for receiving a second cookie that is valid for a second range of URL's from the second web client;
means for receiving a second request that defines a second URL from the first web client; and
means for responding to the second request by transmitting the second cookie to the first web client if the second URL is within the second range of URL's.

10. The computing device of claim 9, further comprising:
means for further responding to the second request by transmitting the first cookie to the first web client if the second URL is within the first range of URL's.

11. The computing device of claim 10, wherein the network comprises the INTERNET.

12-14. (canceled)

15. A system comprising:
a first web client;
a second web client; and
a computer remote from the first web client and the second web client;
wherein the first web client is operable to: receive a first resource and a first cookie from a first web server and configured to automatically respond thereto by

processing the first resource and transmitting the first cookie to a remote computer; and receive a URL from a user and is responsive thereto by first transmitting a request to the remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL; and

wherein the second web client is operable to receive a second resource and a second cookie from a second web server and configured to automatically respond thereto by processing the second resource and transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer; and

wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the first cookie from the first web client and to then store the first cookie; and

wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the second cookie from the second web client and to then store the second cookie; and

wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the request from the first web client and is responsive thereto by: (a) transmitting the stored first cookie to the first web client if the stored first cookie is valid for the URL; and (b) transmitting the stored second cookie to the first web client if the stored second cookie is valid for the URL.

16. (canceled).

17. The system of claim 15, further comprising:

a monitoring device operable to monitor a first device to detect when the device generates a pre-defined signal and to respond thereto by generating a notification that the signal was generated; and

wherein the first web client and the second web client are operable by a user to retrieve the notification.

18. The system of claim 17, wherein the first device is a printer.

19. The system of 18, further comprising:

the printer; and

wherein the printer includes a replaceable consumable cartridge; and
wherein the printer is operable to generate the signal when a consumable in the cartridge moves below a pre-determined level.

20. The system of claim 19, wherein the printer is a laser printer.

21. A computer readable medium having programming thereon for performing a method comprising:

a web client receiving input from a user defining the URL;
in response to receiving the user input, the web client automatically transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL; then
the web client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer;
the web client transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the web server;
the web client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the web server;
and
in response to receiving the second cookie, the web client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage.

22. A computer readable medium having programming thereon for performing a method comprising:

receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first web client;
receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second web client; and
responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie to the second web client if the first URL is within the first range of URL's.

23. A computer readable medium having programming thereon for:
making a first web client operable to: receive a first resource and a first cookie from a first web server and configured to automatically respond thereto by processing

the first resource and transmitting the first cookie to a remote computer; and receive a URL from a user and is responsive thereto by first transmitting a request to the remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL; and

making a second web client operable to receive a second resource and a second cookie from a second web server and configured to automatically respond thereto by processing the second resource and transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer; and

making a computer remote from the first web client and the second web client operable to: receive the first cookie from the first web client and to then store the first cookie; receive the second cookie from the second web client and to then store the second cookie; and receive the request from the first web client and is responsive thereto by: (a) transmitting the stored first cookie to the first web client if the stored first cookie is valid for the URL; and (b) transmitting the stored second cookie to the first web client if the stored second cookie is valid for the URL.

APPENDIX II -- EVIDENCE SUBMITTED UNDER RULES 130, 131 OR 132

none

APPENDIX III -- RELATED PROCEEDINGS

none